

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

RAHMIN CALDWELL,

Plaintiff pro se,

v.

CITY OF VINELAND POLICE
DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendants,

Civil Action
No. 05-5143 (JBS)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

SIMANDLE, District Judge:

This matter comes before the Court upon the motion of Plaintiff pro se, Rahmin Caldwell, for an Order of Protection [Docket Item 7].

The Court has considered Plaintiff's submissions - a certification, a notice of motion and medical treatment records - and is unable to discern what relief Plaintiff is seeking at this time.

THE COURT FINDS as follows:

1. Plaintiff has not complied with Local Civ. R. 7.1(d), which requires him to file a brief in support of the motion or a statement that no brief is necessary and the reasons therefor;
2. Plaintiff has not complied with Local Civ. R. 7.1(e), which requires him to annex to his motion a proposed order; and

3. As a result of Plaintiff's violations of the Local Rules, Plaintiff has failed to inform the Court of what relief he is seeking, against whom and why he is seeking that relief.

4. Therefore, the Court will dismiss this motion [Docket Item 7] without prejudice, and Plaintiff is permitted to file a new motion that complies with the Rules and more clearly sets out what relief he is seeking, against whom and why.

The accompanying order will be entered.

October 11, 2006
Date

s/ Jerome B. Simandle
JEROME B. SIMANDLE
United States District Judge